

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 24-41 are pending in the application, with claim 24 being the independent claim. Claims 1-23 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. New claims 24-41 are sought to be added. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Objections to the Drawings

In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to because "character '124', in page 8, line 21 and character '204', in page 11, line 1 are not shown on the drawings." Applicants submit that these omissions were due to typographical errors in the specification. Applicants have amended page 8, line 21 to replace "124" with the correct reference number, "214", for the plurality of cryptography processing engines shown in FIG. 2. Applicants have also amended page 11, line to replace "204" with the correct reference number, "304", for the packet classifier unit shown in FIG. 3. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection to the drawing.

Objections to the Specification

The specification was objected to because "heading appears underlined throughout the disclosed specification." Applicants have amended the headings in the specification to remove the underlining. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection to the specification.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the Examiner's suggestion related to the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. Applicants note that 37 CFR 1.77 does not require that the specification include each listed section. Thus, when the application was filed, Applicants omitted those sections listed in 37 CFR 1.77(b)(1)-(11) which were not applicable to the specification. If the Examiner believes the omitted sections are required, Applicants request that the Examiner issue a new non-final Office Action specifically stating an objection to the arrangement of the specification.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7, 9-17, and 22-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barlow, *et al*, U.S. Patent No. 6,038,551 (Barlow), in view of Markham, U.S. Patent No. 5,796,836 (Markham). Claims 8 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barlow in view of Markham as applied to claims 1-7, 9-17, and 22-23 and further in view of Krawczak, *et al*, U.S. Patent No. 5,796,744 (Krawczak). Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barlow in view of Markham and further in view of Krawczak, as applied to claims 8 and 18, and still in view of Wasilewski, *et al*, U.S. Patent No. 5,870,474 (Wasilewski). Claims 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being

unpatentable over Barlow in view of Wasilewski. Applicants have canceled claims 1-23 by the above amendment, rendering these rejections moot.

Applicants submit that neither Barlow, Markham, Krawczak, nor Wasilewski, alone or in combination, teach or suggest a system including “a distributor unit that distributes a plurality of packets and security association information associated with the plurality of packets according to a distribution scheme; and a plurality of security processing engines that perform authentication and cryptographic functions, coupled to the distributor unit, wherein the plurality of security processing engines receive at least a portion of the security association information associated with the packets, and wherein the plurality of security processing engines process the plurality of packets in parallel” as recited in new independent claims 24. Also, neither Barlow, Markham, Krawczak, nor Wasilewski teach or suggest a router, firewall, network communication device, security gateway, server, or network line card that includes the elements of claim 24, as recited in dependent claims 36-41, respectively.

For at least these reasons, and in view of their own features, claims 25-41 which depend from claim 24 are patentable over Barlow, Markham, Krawczak, or Wasilewski, alone or in combination.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for

allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Robert Sokohl
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 36,013

Date: July 2, 2004

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600